



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

AM

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,197	09/24/2003	Carl J. Skeps	58695US002	2656
32692	7590	07/02/2004	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY			WALLING, MEAGAN S	
PO BOX 33427			ART UNIT	
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			PAPER NUMBER	
			2863	

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

22

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/669,197	Applicant(s) SKEPS ET AL.	
	Examiner Meagan S Walling	Art Unit 2863	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Meagan Walling.

(3) Brian Szymanski.

(2) John Barlow.

(4) Steven Floeder.

Date of Interview: 30 June 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 2, 3, and 6.

Identification of prior art discussed: Eichel et al. (US 6,266,437), Dalmia et al. (US 6,259,109), and Floeder et al. (US 2002/0110269).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant described the disclosed invention and discussed how it differed from the cited prior art. Specifically it was stated that the Eichel reference lacked the claimed steps of extracting identified regions from the digital information and analyzing the extracted regions with at least one subsequent algorithm. The arguments will be considered and a thorough review of the cited prior art will be made after a written response is received.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required